UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,140	06/29/2001	Shari Gharavy	85160.923	5419

33438   7590   03/07/2006

HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 December 2005_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the request for continued

examination filed 20 December 2005.

2.   Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed 22 December 2005 fails to

comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the IDS

identifies an applicant and application number not related to the current application. It

has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not

been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-

submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement

or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes

of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the

statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e).

See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Claims 1-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Hyman et al. (USPN 6,772,395 B1—filing date 2/1/2000), hereinafter Hyman.

        As per independent claim 1, Hyman discloses an extensible method for

simplifying input provided to a computer program (Hyman discloses a data flow

architecture that can modify and simplify data in the Abstract, lines 1-15) comprising:

creating a framework for a first grammar level (in col. 4, lines 5-15, the use of schemas

as frameworks in conjunction with the invention is disclosed); performing a first

transformation of said framework to generate a first set of rules relating to interpretation

of said first grammar level (transformation in conjunction with the schemas is inherently

involved with the transformation described in col. 3, lines 20-35); performing a second

transformation of said framework to generate a first presentation style for said first

grammar level (transformation in conjunction with an XSL presentation style is

described in col. 3, lines 20-35); obtaining a user defined input in said first grammar,

said user defined input conforming to said first set of rules (Hyman describes a

message bus in col. 3, lines 35-50, which obtains rule-based user input); applying said

first set of rules and said first presentation style to said user defined input to generate

an output in a second grammar understood by an application's parser (applying the

rules and the presentation style occurs in the transformation described by col. 3, lines

20-35).

As per dependent claim 2, Hyman describes a method wherein creating a

framework comprises: creating one or more files having grammar definitions conforming

to a second set of rules (this limitation corresponds with the XML schemas of col. 4,

lines 5-15); and transforming said one or more files into said framework using a second

presentation style conforming to said framework (using the XML schemas is described

in conjunction with XSL transformation in col. 4, lines 5-15 and col. 3, lines 20-35.

As per dependent claim 3, Hyman discloses in element 410 of Figure 4B a first transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a third style.

As per dependent claim 4, Hyman discloses in element 420 of Figure 4B a second transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a fourth style.

As per dependent claim 5, Hyman uses XML for the first grammar of said user defined input (col. 11, lines 5-15), and XML is extensible.

As per dependent claim 6, Hyman discloses that the second grammar understood by said applications parser is that of XML and XSL, which is inherently fixed.

As per dependent claim 7, Hyman discloses in col. 3, lines 20-35 that the data representation language is extensible markup language (XML).

As per independent claim 8, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 9, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 10, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 13, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 14, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 15, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 16, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 17, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 18, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 19, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 20, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 21, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 22, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 23, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 24, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 25, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 26, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 27, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per dependent claim 28, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 20 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Hyman neither teaches nor suggests "performing a first transformation of said framework to generate **a first set of rules relating to interpretation of said first grammar level** (page 9)." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hyman discloses a first set of rules relating to interpretation of said first grammar level (transformation in conjunction with the schemas is inherently involved with the transformation described in col. 3, lines 20-35). Further, Figure 4B shows a

first set of rules (getdistinct.xsl) relating to interpretation of the first grammar level (records).

The applicant further argues that Hyman neither teaches nor suggests "**performing a second transformation <u>of said framework</u> to generate a first presentation style for said grammar level (page 9)**." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hyman discloses performing a second transformation of said framework to generate a first presentation style for said first grammar level (transformation in conjunction with an XSL presentation style is described in col. 3, lines 20-35). Further, Figure 4B shows a second transformation of the framework to generate a first presentation style for the grammar level. Here, the first grammar level (records) has initially had the first set of rules (getdistinct.xsl) applied, thus creating output (distinct). This output (distinct) then has a second transformation applied (process.xsl) to generate a presentation tree (shown in Figure 4D).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER